Where SPUP Faculty and Programs Go

All seven faculty members and several degree programs of the School of Public and Urban Policy have been found homes and the special task force under Deputy Provost Richard C. Clelland has been disbanded.

The task force’s final report (text in full, page 3) distributes the faculty in the Graduate School of Fine Arts, Wharton School and School of Arts and Sciences.

The two graduate programs leading to master’s and Ph.D. level are reloaded in two schools—the Energy Management and Policy Program in GSFA, and the Public Policy Analysis Program in Wharton. A third set of degree programs—the Master of Governmental Administration program, offered in Harrisburg and Philadelphia—also goes to GSFA.

Given the goal “to strengthen public policy studies at the University,” however, the task force also called for assembly of an additional group to consider the long run status of such studies here.

The faculty and their relocations:
- Professor Theodore Hershberg and Associate Professor Stephen Feldman to City and Regional Planning, GSFA;
- Professor James Laing to Decision Sciences, Wharton;
- Associate Professors Janet Pack and Arie Schin ARR to Legal Studies and Public Management, Wharton;
- Assistant Professors Kriss Sjoblom and Eugene Kroch to Economics, SAS.

COUNCIL: Research, Open Expression, Draft Resistance

The University Council was a clearinghouse for discussion last Wednesday, its only action the referral to the Research Committee of Dr. Barry Cooperman’s new draft document summing up University policies for potential corporate/industrial sponsors.

The draft deals with items from three existing policies: the Guidelines for the Conduct of Sponsored Research; the Patent Policy; and the Policy on Extramural Consultative Business Activities of Standing Faculty Members.

Dr. Cooperman as Vice Provost for Research presented the draft for discussion after the Vice President for Health Affairs, Dr. Thomas Langfitt, summarized policy issues arising from new ventures between universities and corporations that formed part of the subject matter of December’s Penn-sponsored national conference.

Some faculty members questioned passages that recast existing statements on the confidentiality of proprietary information and on allowable delays in publication. One member also asked if the ability to generate research funds from the private sector could affect criteria used in faculty appointments; the response was that it would not.

The draft will be published for comment in Almanac next week. At meeting’s end, Council voted to refer it to the Committee on Research, which is expected to have a subcommittee expedite review for return of the statement to Council.

Meanwhile, President Sheldon Hackney has named Dr. Louis Girifalco (below left) to an advisory role in preparing for private-sector research initiatives (see page 3).

Open Expression: An amendment to the charge of the Committee on Open Expression was distributed in preparation for voting in March—not the once-proposed substantial revision that would make “credible threats of violation” a violation, but a brief addition that calls for an annual open meeting to familiarize COE members with their roles. COE Chair Madeleine Joulie’s request for administrative support in communicating the Guidelines, and for stronger coordination among security, VPUL, the Committee and student sponsors of controversial speakers, drew a favorable response from Provost Thomas Ehrlich.

Draft Resistance: President Sheldon Hackney’s draft for discussion toward a policy statement on the Student Amendment drew strong debate. While several UA leaders objected to Dr. Hackney’s proposal to join with other institutions in seeking to remove universities from the enforcement role, a series of faculty and GAPSA speakers supported lobbying such as that now being done via the A.C.E. Also strongly debated was the portion of the statement that calls for no replacement of financial aid lost to students who fail to comply with selective service registration requirements. Dr. Hackney is expected to publish a follow-up document shortly.

IN BRIEF

Copeland for City Planning: Paley Professor and Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts Lee G. Copeland was elected chairman of the City Planning Commission last month. He was one of five new members appointed to the nine-member commission by Mayor Green. Cited for 20 years’ achievements in architecture, planning, and education, Professor Copeland had another special qualification: As a student here he was also employed as a city planner by the Commission in 1962-63.

HERS Institute: February 24, HERS alumni are hosting a brown bag general information meeting to discuss the Summer Institute For Women in Higher Education Administration sponsored by Bryn Mawr College and HERS Mid-Atlantic. Women administrators and faculty members may apply for acceptance to the month-long program on academic governance, budgeting and training. This year’s application procedures will be announced shortly. The information meeting will be held at 1 p.m. in the Green Room, Class of 1920 Commons. Information: Carol Baffi-Dugan, Ext. 7324.

Franklin Follies: Auditions are this week in Houston Hall for the University’s first faculty-staff revue. Dancers must try out on Tuesday, but individuals and groups proposing music, comedy, spoofs, or other routines can choose any of the three dates: Saturday, February 19, 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Monday, February 21, 5 p.m.-9 p.m.; Tuesday, February 22, 5 p.m.-9 p.m.

For questions: Liz Greco, Ext. 6404 (9 to noon) or Marjorie Weiss, Ext. 8478 (1 to 5 p.m.)

TV Auditions, Too: To audition for a Penn presence on a new Disney Channel show called “Up and Coming,” reserve Wednesday, February 23 but call Maijorie Weiss, Ext. 8478 (1 to 5 p.m.)

To Exhibit: The Faculty Club Art Committee is currently reviewing work for exhibition in the Club’s 1983-84 schedule. Interested University-related artists should call Maury Burrison at Ext. 5831 for information.

Rescheduled: The February 12 concert in which pianist Lambert Orkis and the Penn Contemporary Players introduce Music Professor Richard Wernick’s Piano Sonata: Reflections of a Dark Light (1982) has been rescheduled for February 19. The free concert will be held in Lang Concert Hall, Swarthmore College at 8:15 p.m.

**INSIDE**

- Senate Chair: Non-Tenure Appointments, p. 2
- SPUP Task Force: Final Report, p. 3
- President on Industry Ties, p. 3
- On TIAA-CREF Consent Form, p. 8

**Special Advisor:** Dr. Louis A. Girifalco, University Professor of Materials Science and former Vice Provost for Research, has a six-month planning assignment on ties with industry (p. 3)
On Long-Term Academic Appointments Not Leading to Tenure

The issue of long term untenured academic appointments is, in my opinion, the most serious to face the University in this decade.

Tenure protects universities by encouraging a life-long commitment to scholarship, freedom of investigation, and willingness to take risks—both scientific and intellectual—without which fundamental advances are impossible. To secure the benefits of such advances society supports and protects universities; whatever slows those advances imperils that support. The creation of long-term untenured academic appointments as a response solely to immediate economic problems must therefore ultimately be self-defeating. Their creation as a response to genuine academic problems, or as a means to desirable expansion of university programs, entails very serious long-term risks and should not be undertaken without safeguards guaranteeing that the University will remain a center of the freest and deepest inquiry. To this end it is at least necessary to set limits on the number of such appointments as a percentage of the standing faculty in a school. This is the case with clinician educators in the Medical School. But tenure is part of the coin in which the professoriate is paid, and the Gresham’s law will inexorably press on those limits, as it has already done there in a most serious way. Moreover, small percentage limits in a large school would (and presently do) permit some departments to consist primarily of non-tenure accruing appointments. This oversight demands attention. But a firmer safeguard than arbitrary limits is needed to prevent the cheapening of non-tenure appointments and to assure that those who accept them do so out of an informed choice, unpressured by deans, chairmen, or other administrators. It is essential that the coin substituting for tenure be something of truly equal value, not only to the individual who must elect whether to stand for tenure or a long-term untenured appointment, but also to the University. Whatever this coin may be, it is essential that the procedure leading to appointment be the same for tenure track and long-term non-tenure track appointments, and in particular, that they pass the same scrutiny by tenured faculty and through precisely the same committees. But the coin, if one can be found, may vary with the school and type of appointment.

1. Clinician educators and all whose continuing appointment depends on generation of sufficient income from sources outside the University.

Tenure irrevocably commits a fraction of the University’s financial resources to maintaining the salary of the individual. Appointment of a clinician educator, whose salary is supported by patient fees, should require a similar irrevocable commitment of a genuine opportunity to earn those fees. This may involve an important scarce resource, space, as well as ancillary services, and appropriate access to patients (including, in the case of certain specialties clearly dependent on them, referrals), so that the opportunity to earn the necessary income is not subject to arbitrary limitation by colleagues or administrators. As the opportunity to teach is (or should be) the primary inducement to accept a University appointment at lower compensation than could be achieved outside, clinician educators must, along with tenured faculty, have as a basic prerogative access to students (including, where appropriate, residents). No appointment should be made of any clinician educator, however great his potential to generate income, if he is not in fact an educator. Sometimes the commitment of space and/or services to a clinician educator will have to be made primarily by an institution other than the University (e.g., Children’s Hospital or Graduate Hospital), which would then acquire some control over the appointment process. Nevertheless, the commitment is essential and it is the University’s obligation to assure that it is explicit and enforceable, for that commitment is in this case the coin substituting for tenure.

2. Senior lecturers, clinical lecturers, and all whose salary must come from university sources.

The College faculty has debated the creation of long-term but untenured senior lecturers, most particularly for training students to proficiency in certain languages; loss of specific individuals at the end of the usual seven-year probationary period would, it is claimed, have serious adverse effects on the programs. The Law School has considered the advisability of appointing clinical lecturers for the training of students in basic litigation skills; retaining the most competent would, it is claimed, be impossible without renewal beyond the seven-year probationary period. In both cases, appointments would terminate if the programs did. Here no income is generated directly by the lecturer so there can be no meaningful guarantee of an opportunity to earn income which would support the salary. The only guarantee can be of the continuance of the program unless there is some level of financial exigency set in advance. But this must inevitably be a lesser guarantee than that of tenure, which can be terminated only by such exigency as will close at least a whole department or school. It is inevitable, therefore, that the appointments, if made, will be viewed as terminable and therefore as needing less scrutiny. In view of the dangers which they create for the principles of tenure, they can be justified only if it is shown that essential programs utilize them and can be staffed in no other way. This may be so for clinical education in a professional discipline like law, but in non-professional areas, like languages, the argument seems more tenuous. The study of a language stripped of history, culture, literature, or linguistics is not justified within a university except as a crash course facilitating later scholarship. Even if it can be done best with native speakers having no other function there seems no reason to classify such speakers as faculty except, perhaps, to qualify for federal support which might better be utilized to hire a genuine scholar. In the off-cited case of Arabic, scholars capable of teaching both language and literature, along with culture, are not lacking. Some are not native speakers, but the loss to the student which cannot be made up with a tape is probably immeasurably less than the gain from contact with such a person.

In summary, long-term untenured academic appointments create substantial dangers which can be permanently abated only by guarantees adequately substituting for tenure. This may be possible for clinician educators, but corresponding guarantees do not seem to be available in other areas, although the value of having clinical lecturers in professional non-health areas may justify the risks. In the case of languages and other non-professional areas present arguments seem to me unconvincing, and long-term non-tenure appointments should be made, if at all, only after new and secure safeguards have been devised.

Murray Gerstenhaber
The following was transmitted for publication by the President and the Provost with a letter thanking the chair and members for "an admirable job under trying circumstances" and noting that steps are under way to implement each of the relocations referred to.

Report of the SPUP Transition Task Force
February 3, 1983

Following a decision announced by President Hackney and Provost Ehrlich on September 23, 1982, that the School of Public and Urban Policy (SPUP) should not continue, the SPUP Transition Task Force was set up. It held its first meeting on October 4, 1982 and has continued to meet weekly since that date. It received a charge:

The Task Force will advise the President and Provost on the following matters: within what academic components of the University should SPUP's primary faculty appointments, academic programs, and other activities be located? The interests and needs of all SPUP faculty and students should be considered along with the interests and needs of other components of the University. The Task Force will strive to preserve the programs of SPUP and to strengthen public policy studies at the University.

In view of this charge, the Task Force has not discussed, and will not comment on, the decision to close SPUP.

SPUP, as presently constituted, houses four academic programs:
1. The Ph.D. and M.A. in Public Policy Analysis (PPA) offered by the Graduate Group in Public Policy Analysis;
3. The Master of Governmental Administration (MGA) in Harrisburg, given by the School; and
4. The Master of Governmental Administration (MGA) in Philadelphia, also given by the School.

During the fall semester of 1982, the PPA program enrolled 38 Ph.D. candidates and 27 M.A. candidates while the EMP program enrolled 26 Ph.D. candidates and 73 M.S. candidates. Most of the students in both programs were full time. During the fall semester of 1982, the MGA program on the Harrisburg campus enrolled 69 students all of whom were part time. The MGA on the Philadelphia campus is a new program that was in the planning stages during the spring of 1982. It now enrolls 9 students, 3 part time, 6 full time. The Standing Faculty of the School are seven in number: two professors, two tenured associate professors, one untenured associate professor, and two assistant professors.

The Task Force's charge, together with comments from members of the Administration, makes it clear that preservation of existing programs and easy transition of members of the Standing Faculty to other Schools should be high priority objectives. These are essentially short-run objectives. Because the Task Force was concerned about possible lack of congruence between such criteria and the last goal mentioned in the charge, "to strengthen public policy studies at the University," it recommended to the Provost that an additional group be assembled to consider the long-run status of programs of SPUP and to strengthen public policy studies at the University. The President and Provost have agreed to accept this recommendation.

As an approach to the immediate problem, the Task Force at an early meeting examined the question of which schools and departments might reasonably house the SPUP programs and Standing Faculty. Lists of possible receiving schools and departments were constructed by the Task Force, and in every case the schools and departments upon which agreement has been reached appear on these lists of logical locations.

While the Task Force was at work, direct discussions and negotiations were carried out between representatives of the SPUP programs and faculty and possible receiving organizations. The Task Force monitored these activities, hearing reports from its chairperson and from others involved in it. It stated in Almanac that it would like to receive letters discussing the situation and making recommendations. It met with the Dean of one school; on another occasion it met with representatives of the students enrolled in both SPUP Graduate Groups. It attempted to be open to the opinions of those who wished to be heard.

Some members of the Task Force believed that the Administration should have more vigorously addressed the problem of moving all SPUP programs to a single location. However, the arrangements reviewed by the Task Force were strongly influenced by the desires of the individual faculty members concerned and by the Administration's desire not to separate faculty members from the programs with which they were most clearly associated. During its deliberations, the Task Force was informed of the priorities of the SPUP faculty members. It agreed that these were indeed important although it was concerned about potential conflict between present individual preferences and long-term goals of the University.

In conclusion then, we find the following relocations to be acceptable and agree that negotiations to effect them should proceed. In each case the change should take place as of July 1, 1983.

From the President

Planning for Stronger Ties with Industry

An important component of future University planning consists of Penn's relations with industry. The conference that we sponsored last December underscored the major opportunities and issues involved in those relations. Over the course of the next decade, we are convinced, the University can and should strengthen its ties with industry in ways that preserve and promote the academic functions of the institution.

I am pleased to announce that University Professor Louis Girifalco has agreed to serve as Special Advisor to the President for Industry Relations for the next six months with a mandate to lead the design and development of a plan to promote actively the University's ties with industry. Professor Girifalco will work in close collaboration with Vice Provost for Research Barry Cooperman, Vice President for Development Ross Webber, and Vice President for Health Affairs Thomas Langfitt. Each of their three offices has a key role to play in this area. At the same time, each of them has urged that an integrated University-wide set of plans be prepared to take maximum advantage of those potential links between industry and University that would contribute to the basic missions of the University.

Professor Girifalco will work over the course of the months ahead to prepare a strategic plan. He will seek the advice of industry leaders in this area and around the country as well as the counsel of many within the University. On the basis of the arrangements he proposes, we will then move to implement a set of efforts to take full advantage of the University's extraordinary comparative advantages in many fields of interest to industry. Perhaps most important, the University offers a unique set of interactions among many disciplines that should prove of enormous interest to many industries in a wide variety of areas.

Our basic aim is to enhance the academic quality of the University in its research and teaching. We are convinced that partnership arrangements with industry can be an important dimension in realizing that aim. We are fortunate that Professor Girifalco will serve as a focal point in the efforts.
A Shocker

The Senate meeting of February 2 was a shocker for me. After listening to the explanations I realized for the first time that what was proposed, and what was passed on November 17 by one of the smaller faculty representatives in recent history, was an actual reduction of the hard fought and won faculty employee benefits, and one of the benefits that the vast majority of the faculty can hardly afford to forego now or in the future. The "information only" meeting conveyed such shock to the Senate leadership, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and to the University, we hope, to make sure that no one any longer confuses the recent reserve and quiet with acquiescence.

Speaker after speaker for more than two hours made clear that the proposed reduction of employee benefits under any guise is not acceptable under any circumstances. A large number of faculty made it clear that we will spare no effort in fighting whoever we need to fight to make certain that we receive justice on that matter.

In essence, however, the issue is not that of distributing employee benefits among faculty. The issue is not to "rob Peter to pay Paul" in spite of the fact that some willing "mediators" are trying to put it that way. The issue is the fair treatment of all faculty. Even in its most limited form the issue of tuition remission of faculty children is a major battle.

The undersigned members of the standing faculty of the University of Pennsylvania petition the Senate to initiate and continue negotiations with the administration about the supplementary employee benefits that our faculty should receive just in order to maintain what was agreed to some years ago.

I am circulating a petition which requests from the Senate chair to start negotiations along the above lines. Several dozen members of the standing faculty have already signed this petition. In case other colleagues would want to sign the petition, please call Ext. 8481 or 5731 and ask for a copy. Each new signature is appreciated and will add to the pressure.

--Anthony R. Tomazinis
Professor of City and Regional Planning

Text of Petition

The undersigned members of the standing faculty of the University of Pennsylvania petition the Senate of the Faculty, and, through the Chair, the Faculty Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to initiate and continue negotiations with the administration about the supplementary employee benefits that our faculty should receive just in order to maintain what was agreed to some years ago.

In essence, however, the issue is not that of distributing employee benefits among faculty. The issue is not to "rob Peter to pay Paul" in spite of the fact that some willing "mediators" are trying to put it that way. The issue is the fair treatment of all faculty. Even in its most limited form the issue of tuition remission of faculty children is a major battle.

The undersigned members of the standing faculty of the University of Pennsylvania petition the Senate to initiate and continue negotiations with the administration about the supplementary employee benefits that our faculty should receive just in order to maintain what was agreed to some years ago.

I am circulating a petition which requests from the Senate chair to start negotiations along the above lines. Several dozen members of the standing faculty have already signed this petition. In case other colleagues would want to sign the petition, please call Ext. 8481 or 5731 and ask for a copy. Each new signature is appreciated and will add to the pressure.

--Anthony R. Tomazinis
Professor of City and Regional Planning

Re: The Ballot

All ballots must be received by 2 p.m. Monday, February 21, and must arrive at the Senate Office (15 College Hall) in the outer envelope provided for the purpose, Senate Chair Murray Gershenhaber reminds. Any voter who did not receive both inner and outer envelopes, hasspoiled a ballot, or has questions should call the Senate Office immediately at Ext. 6943.

The following letter and petition were sent for response to the chair of Senate and of the Economic Status Committee. Dr. Sam Preston of the latter committee in turn referred the letter to Dr. Martin Pring, who contributed option C to the ballot. His reply is below, followed by Dr. Gershenhaber's next page.

Appalled, Too

I too was appalled at the tenor of the Senate Meeting of February 2, but for quite different reasons.

For purposes of illustration we can divide "all faculty," like Gaul, into three parts: those who, while employed at Penn, have children educated here, those whose children attend other colleges, and those who do not reap the tuition benefit. These latter include not only those of us who, intentionally or not, are childless, but also those who, voluntarily or otherwise, leave Penn before their children are of college age, those who were employed here after their children completed their college education, and those whose children for whatever reason do not attend college. To get some idea of the differences in total costs to those three categories, consider a family with two children. If the children attend Penn as undergraduates, under the current benefits package, their faculty parent receives a tuition remission close to $80,000. If they attend another college, the benefit would be worth $7,200. If they do not attend college while the faculty parent is employed at Penn, or do not exist, the "benefit" is zero. The inequity is glaring, and would only be compounded by any general increase of the total package. What I found distasteful at the Senate Meeting was the insensitivity of those expecting to receive the larger of these benefit figures. Fairness to all faculty would in fact require a revolution far less the likelihood of those who have children than any change so far proposed.

The majority of the attendants at the Senate Meeting were plainly members of a special interest group whose importunities were patiently heard but, correctly in my opinion, not acted upon by the Senate leaders present. A particularly insidious myth that was widely perpetuated was that it was necessary to "rob Peter to pay Paul". Many variables, some under our control, some not, determine the total pool of funds available for faculty compensation. Under any socially and economically responsible set of policies its range of variation is not large. We should all applaud attempts, such as that currently being undertaken by the Senate Committee on Administration, to ensure that it is maximized within these constraints. But once the decisions are taken the pool is fixed. It cannot be arbitrarily increased; indeed, there is a significant threat that, in current control of policy, such as current, hopefully transient, trends in government policy and the demographic changes described by Professor Scandura at the Senate Meeting and in Almanac (Speaking Out, 2/8/83) will reduce it. To fantasize otherwise is unrealistic and does a substantial disservice to the hardworking and diligent Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

It also obfuscates the issues for those who may be led to think that they are not affected by the level of the tuition benefit package. These already substantial benefits to a few come directly from all of our pockets, and any
increase will be from the same source. The assistant professor who does not achieve tenure and the older faculty member nearing retirement, as well as the childless, will never be recompensed because they are among all of those who do not stand to gain by an increase of tuition benefits to vote for their reduction, lest their other categories of compensation be reduced. I have urged a gradual reduction of the tuition benefit rather than, as is clearly most fair, its immediate elimination, for three reasons: equity, competition in faculty recruitment, and collegiality. I do not wish to deny my colleagues a perquisite that they expect with reasonable certainty. We should plainly grandfather those who are now preparing to enter college, but the children of those who have foregone higher increases in direct compensation for many years in hopes of collecting from a lottery, in which their a posteriori probability of success is less than even, rings hollow. Nor do I wish to put the University at a substantial disadvantage with respect to similarly eminent institutions in recruiting new faculty who happen to have children approaching college age. The figures presented at the Senate Meeting reassure me that our posture is among the more generous and that we have considerable latitude for change before facing this risk. Lastly, I accept some collegial obligation to allow the children of my colleagues freely to attend my classes. This would be satisfied if, for example, the benefit at Penn consisted only of a remission of that fraction of tuition that is applied to faculty compensation. I recognize that I have opened as many (if not more) important questions in this response as has Professor Tomazinis in his letter. They will both have served their purpose if they stimulate all faculty thoughtfully to evaluate the issues and respond to the mail ballot.

—Murray Gerstenhaber.
Chair, Faculty Senate

Paleontological Remnant

At the Faculty Senate Tuition Benefit "informational meeting" for Feb. 2, 1983, we learned one new and semiannual important fact.

The present $900 away-from-Penn tuition remission is a paleontological remnant from the 1960s when $900 constituted 30% of the then $1800 Penn tuition. The $900 in turn evolved from its predecessor benefit of $750 "away" when the Penn tuition was $1500. This was the tuition benefit when I joined the faculty—100% Penn tuition or 50% of Penn's tuition elsewhere. The precedent of full Penn tuition and 50% non-Penn tuition has been made 18 years ago and is hardly being improved upon by present options. Somehow the fact that this is what the tuition benefit was intended to be and the then 50% benefit away has not increased with Penn's present tuition, is the point that has failed to reach all of us during the past year's concern to equalize our tuition benefit among Penn and non-Penn children of Penn faculty.

The present scramble of options and pressure of a ballot forcing our choice between 100%/10% or 75%/40% therefore totally misses the point. The inequity is not that 50% of the faculty now enjoy 100% of the tuition benefit and should give up part to the other 50% of the faculty, but that the administration has somehow managed to convince us that the $900, formerly 50% of Penn's tuition, should not have been increased as Penn's tuition increased from 1965 onward.

To me, it is patently clear that this "new" information that emerged from the February 2, 1983, Senate meeting totally invalidates any consideration of the choices posed on the ballot sent out yesterday by the Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty and that a total reconsideration of the question is necessary.

Two corollary points are equally clear from the February 2 meeting. The first is that the overwhelming majority of the nearly 100 faculty attending were in agreement with the conclusions of this letter. The second is that the Senate leadership who conducted the meeting failed to see to the ballot they had already made up, that they adamantly refused to respond to the sense of the February 2 meeting that the ballot should be put off and the tuition question given renewed consideration. I can understand their dilemma. They have been drawn as unwillingly as were the rest of us into believing that we must consider only "constant cost" options, i.e., options that let the administration off the hook at no additional cost. But that is the real point of our "informational" discovery. It is not the faculty who now enjoy 100% tuition benefit who should bear the cost by reduction to 75% nor the faculty who get only $900/year tuition benefit who should bear the cost. It is the administration who should bear the responsibility for finding the money to redress the inequity that has been awaiting redress for these past 18 years. No ballot will be necessary to choose to continue the 100% Penn tuition and 50% elsewhere benefit.

I therefore urge a new meeting of the Senate to further discuss these important issues no matter what the leadership's preemptive ballot yields. The ballot can only cause 50% of our faculty to lose no matter who wins. Let's all get behind the 100%/50% benefit so we all can win by returning to where we were already in 1965!

—P. A. Liebman, Professor of Anatomy and Ophthalmology

Advisory Panel?

The proposed change (Plan A.1 in the bulletin) in tuition benefits, if it is approved, will cause considerable inequity in some cases. To deal with this it would be desirable to create an advisory panel to the Provost to consider cases where unfair losses to a specific faculty member can be shown, and advise the Provost.

—D. K. Detweiler
Professor of Physiology

More Discussion?

In the February 8 issue of Almanac three colleagues, in essence, spoke out against the concern of many of us that long-planned-for tuition benefits are potentially being swept away with unforeseen haste. None of them appear to have considered the basis of our outcry, that this change will come with no grandfathering, only a bit of "older brothering." It is simply unethical to remove with almost no warning a benefit that has been used as part of faculty recruitment to Penn or as incentive to retain. It will be devastating financially to some.

The ballot as it stands is imperfect and does not allow the faculty to express its desires adequately. We believe we should work for more extensive discussions on this issue before a final decision is made by the administration.

—Adrian R. Morrison
Professor of Anatomy
—Peter Dodson
Associate Professor of Anatomy

Doing One's Thing

I am in disagreement with the views expressed by the Senate Chair during two Senate meetings (11/17/82 and 02/02/83) called to discuss the proposed changes in the tuition benefit for faculty children.

Professor Gerstenhaber pointed out more than once that the members of the Senate should appreciate the willingness of our admin-
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Children's Activities
Film Series
February 19 The Lavender Hill Mob
February 26 Belknoths and Broomsticks
The Saturday children's film series is free. Films are screened at 10:30 a.m., Harrison Auditorium, the University Museum.

Workshop
February 26 Winter Tree Crafts. 10 a.m.-noon, Morris Arboretum, $10 for one child and parent.
Information; registration: 247-5777.

Conferences
February 18 Shakespeare Symposium: Shakespeare Studied Today, honoring the 50th anniversary of the Furness Shakespeare Library, Special Collections, Van Pelt Library; 9:30 a.m.-6:30 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, University Museum. Admission: $20, members and students $18, without lunch $10 less. February 18 is pre-registration deadline.

Coursework and Training
Morris Arboretum
February 23 Herb and Spier Wreathmaking, 7:30-9:30 p.m., $28, $21 for Arboretum members.
February 24 Home Orchard Growing, 7-9 p.m., $10, $7.50 for members.
Plant Nomenclature: How do Plants Get Their Names, 7-9:30 p.m., $10, $7.50 for members.
Information: registration: Education Department, 247-5777.

Training Division of Personnel
February 15, 17, 22 Approaching Your Staff Positively, 9 a.m.-noon (participants must attend both sessions) $30 fee per participant charged to the participant's department, following supervisory approval.
February 18 Purchasing Orientation, 2-3:30 p.m. call Ms. Vaccaro, Ext. 4078.
February 17, 24, March 3 Stress Management, noon-1 p.m. (participants must attend all 3 sessions).
February 28 The Art of Delegation, 9 a.m.-noon, $10 fee per participant charged to the participant's department, following supervisory approval.
February 28 March 3 Communicating Under Pressure, 9 a.m.-noon (participants must attend both sessions) $25 fee per participant charged to the participant's department, following supervisory approval.
Information; registration: Training Division, 516 Franklin Building, Ext. 3400.

Workshops
February 19 Racism Awareness Training: lecture by Dr. Robert Moore, Council on Interracial Books for Children; slide show, role plays, discussion, 10 a.m., Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall (Office of Student Life - Year 102 Events).
The Jojeff Ballet Center Concert Group performing pieces ranging from classical to modern. 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Centre (Penn Union Council). Tickets: $8, $6 with Penn I.D. (departmental price).


February 24 - Spring One-Acts, Penn Black Drama Ensemble, 8 p.m., High Rise East Rooftop.


Serious Films

February 26 - Killing Us Softly, noon, 2 p.m.

February 23 - Yes Men, noon; The Weapons of Gordon Parks, 1:30 p.m.; Black at Yale, 2:30 p.m.; Alhaji Bai Konte, 4 p.m.; Clare of Alibori, 4:30 p.m.; Patmore Swope, 6 p.m.; Houston Hall Art Gallery (six films for Year 102). These free films are screened in the Houston Hall Art Gallery by the Office of Student Life; discussions will be held after films. Information: Ext. 6533.

Year 102 Films

February 18 - Tale of O. J. and 4 p.m., Upper Lobby, High Rise North (Racism Committee, Department of Residential Living).

February 17 - Patmore Swope, 10 p.m.; Irvine Auditorium (Penn Union Council).

February 14 - Roots: Chicken George (episode 7), 7:30 p.m., North Campus Common Room, Nichols House (North Campus Residence).

February 23 -intersection and American, 5-6 p.m., 7:30 p.m.; Mayer North (Campus North Residence).

February 23 - Institutional Racism in America, 1 and 4 p.m., Upper Lobby, High Rise North (Racism Committee, Department of Residential Living).

The Learning Tree, 7 p.m.; McClelland Hall (The Quad).

February 17 - Patmore Swope, 10 p.m., Irvine Auditorium (Penn Union Council).

February 14 - Roots: Chicken George (episode 7), 7:30 p.m., North Campus Common Room, Nichols House (North Campus Residence).


February 25 - The Composer’s Guild presents custom, Coffee and a Concert with classical guitarist William Newman, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m., Potbelly Restaurant, University Museum, 5th floor.

Music

February 19 - The University Museum presents the Col·lum·n·um Mus·ic·um Rena·i·si·on Wind Band concerts with Leland Kimball, tenor; 2 p.m., Lower Egyptian Hall (Department of Music); 7:30 p.m., McClelland Hall (The Quad).

February 19 - The Jojeff Ballet Center Concert Group performing pieces ranging from classical to modern. 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Centre (Penn Union Council). Tickets: $8, $6 with Penn I.D. (departmental price).


February 24 - Spring One-Acts, Penn Black Drama Ensemble, 8 p.m., High Rise East Rooftop.


On Stage

February 18 - The National Black Theater’s Soul Fuel, 8 p.m., Annenberg School (Department of Residential Living - Year 102 Events).

February 20 - The Jojeff Ballet Center Concert Group performing pieces ranging from classical to modern. 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Centre (Penn Union Council). Tickets: $8, $6 with Penn I.D. (departmental price).


February 24 - Spring One-Acts, Penn Black Drama Ensemble, 8 p.m., High Rise East Rooftop.


Serious Films

February 26 - Killing Us Softly, noon, 2 p.m.

February 23 - Yes Men, noon; The Weapons of Gordon Parks, 1:30 p.m.; Black at Yale, 2:30 p.m.; Alhaji Bai Konte, 4 p.m.; Clare of Alibori, 4:30 p.m.; Patmore Swope, 6 p.m.; Houston Hall Art Gallery (six films for Year 102). These free films are screened in the Houston Hall Art Gallery by the Office of Student Life; discussions will be held after films. Information: Ext. 6533.

Year 102 Films

February 18 - Tale of O. J. and 4 p.m., Upper Lobby, High Rise North (Racism Committee, Department of Residential Living).

February 17 - Patmore Swope, 10 p.m.; Irvine Auditorium (Penn Union Council).

February 14 - Roots: Chicken George (episode 7), 7:30 p.m., North Campus Common Room, Nichols House (North Campus Residence).

February 23 - intersection and American, 5-6 p.m., 7:30 p.m.; Mayer North (Campus North Residence).

February 23 - Institutional Racism in America, 1 and 4 p.m., Upper Lobby, High Rise North (Racism Committee, Department of Residential Living).

The Learning Tree, 7 p.m.; McClelland Hall (The Quad).

February 19 - The Jojeff Ballet Center Concert Group performing pieces ranging from classical to modern. 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Centre (Penn Union Council). Tickets: $8, $6 with Penn I.D. (departmental price).


February 24 - Spring One-Acts, Penn Black Drama Ensemble, 8 p.m., High Rise East Rooftop.


On Stage

February 18 - The National Black Theater’s Soul Fuel, 8 p.m., Annenberg School (Department of Residential Living - Year 102 Events).

February 20 - The Jojeff Ballet Center Concert Group performing pieces ranging from classical to modern. 8 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Centre (Penn Union Council). Tickets: $8, $6 with Penn I.D. (departmental price).


February 24 - Spring One-Acts, Penn Black Drama Ensemble, 8 p.m., High Rise East Rooftop.

The Comptroller’s Office, in the fall of 1982, sent a letter or series of letters, with appropriate consent forms, to members of the faculty and staff who participated in one of the University’s retirement plans under salary reduction agreement during calendar years 1978 through 1981 inclusive, indicating that the University, on advice of counsel, intended to file for refund of F.I.C.A. taxes paid on salary reduction amounts for those individuals who wanted such refunds and for all University matching contributions. The basis for such claim is a 1981 decision of the United States Supreme Court (Rowan Companies, Inc. vs United States) which casts doubt on the I.R.S. position that amounts under a Section 403(b) annuity program constitute “wages” subject to F.I.C.A. If you have received but not yet returned your consent form(s) and wish to do so, we have extended the deadline for their return to March 10, 1983. If you have misplaced your form(s) or if you have any further questions, please call Martin Alexander at Ext. 7274.

As the University proceeds with the claims process, we want all plan participants affected by this decision to be aware of the following:

I. Only those individuals for whom University earnings are less than the F.I.C.A. maximum wages are eligible for refund. Therefore, a plan participant would be eligible if his/her University earnings were below the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>F.I.C.A. Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$6,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$6,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$6,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$6,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$7,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$7,50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consent forms for calendar 1982 will be mailed on or about May 1, 1983. Until it is determined that our request for refunds has been approved, we will continue withholding F.I.C.A. taxes on salary reduction agreements in calendar 1982.

II. If our claim is upheld, we will then be communicating with all plan participants and advising them to exercise a new consent form to claim any eligible refunds for F.I.C.A. taxes withheld in 1983.

III. The amount of social security retirement benefit lost by consenting to such refund claims differs with each individual, but can be best explained by the following example:

An individual retires in 1982 at the age of 62 and has paid the maximum F.I.C.A. tax throughout his/her working life:

(a) Maximum benefit, with no F.I.C.A. refund is $474.00/month.
(b) If the individual has a 5 percent salary reduction agreement, he/she would receive a refund of approximately $301.00 and a corresponding decrease in monthly retirement benefits of $2.00 to $472.00/month.
(c) If the individual had a 15 percent salary reduction agreement (which approximates maximization), the refund would approximate $905.00 with a corresponding decrease in monthly benefits of $6.00 to $468.00/month. It would take about 12.5 years to lose benefits equal to the refund in example (c) and an investment of the refund and subsequent F.I.C.A. savings would certainly temper the loss.

IV. As stated earlier, the University will refund, to those consenting, their share of the refund if and when it is determined that the claims are proper and the University receives a refund or credit of the overpaid taxes.

---

**Coming: 1982 Personnel Benefit Statements**

As has been done for several years, Personnel Benefit Statements will be mailed to faculty and staff by the Personnel Relations Office. Beginning the week of February 21, faculty and staff who held full-time appointments as of December 31, 1981, will receive statements indicating the combined value of their benefit/compensation package. Since these statements indicate individual levels of coverage, faculty and staff are encouraged to take the time to review their statements carefully. Questions should be addressed to the Benefits Counseling Office on Ext. 7281.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

Job descriptions and qualifications are listed only for those positions which have not previously appeared in *Almanac*. Positions which have appeared in a previous issue are listed by job title, job number and salary to indicate that the position is still available. Listings are condensed from the personnel bulletin boards at:

- Anatomy-Chemistry Building: near Room 358, College Hall: first floor;
- Franklin Building: near Personnel (Room 130);
- Logan Hall: first floor, near Room 117;
- Law School: Room 28, basement;
- Rittenhouse Library: east staircase, second floor;
- Social Work/Casler Building: first floor;
- Steinberg-Dietrich Hall: ground floor;
- Towne Building: mezzanine lobby;
- Van Pelt Library: ask for copy at Reference Desk;
- Veterinary School: first floor, near directory.

For further information call personnel relations. 898-5390. Please call Marstin Alexander at Ext. 7274.

**Support Staff**

Assistant Administrative Assistant I (2 positions) (5389) $12,050-$14,050.

**Research Staff**

Administrative Assistant II (3 positions) (5389) $12,050-$14,050.

**Administrative/Professional Staff**

Assistant Treasurer (4858) $16,350-$22,600.

**Support Staff**

Administrative Assistant II (2 positions) (5389) $12,050-$14,050.

**Support Staff**

Assistant Director (5119) $16,350-$22,600.

**Assistant Treasurer (4858)**

Assistant Treasurer (4858) $16,350-$22,600.

**Staff Writer/Researcher (5378)**

Staff Writer/Researcher (5378) $12,000-$16,000.

**Support Staff**

Administrative Assistant I (2 positions) (5389) $9,250-$12,250.

**Research Staff**

Administrative Assistant II (5 positions) (5389) $12,050-$14,050.

**Administrative/Professional Staff**

Assistant Director III Annual Giving/Director of Medical Alumni Affairs (5400) $16,350-$22,600.

**Support Staff**

Administrative Assistant I (2 positions) (5389) $9,250-$12,250.

**Support Staff**

Administrative Assistant I (2 positions) (5389) $12,050-$14,050.